

CITY OF SAN BRUNO



567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA 94066
Voice: (650) 616-7074
Fax: (650) 873-6749
<http://www.ci.sanbruno.ca.us>

STAFF

Terry Jackson, *Interim Community Development Director*
Gary Binger, *Interim Planning Director*
Aaron Akin, AICP, *Planning Manager*
Mark Sullivan, AICP, *Housing and Redevelopment Manager*
Beilin Yu, *Associate Planner*
Lisa Costa Sanders, *Contract Planner*
Adam Finestone, *Recording Secretary*
Pamela Thompson, *City Attorney*

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Joe Sammut, *Chair*
Sujendra Mishra, *Vice-Chair*
Mary Lou Johnson
Bob Marshall Jr.
Kevin Chase
Rick Biasotti
Perry Petersen

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 16, 2005
San Bruno Senior Center
1555 Crystal Springs Blvd.
7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER at 7:02 pm

ROLL CALL

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Chair Sammut	X	
Vice Chair Mishra		X
Commissioner Johnson	X	
Commissioner Marshall	X	
Commissioner Chase	X	
Commissioner Biasotti	X	
Commissioner Petersen	X	

STAFF PRESENT:

Planning Division: Interim Community Development Director: Terry Jackson
Planning Manager: Aaron Akin
Contract Planner: Lisa Costa Sanders
Associate Planner: Beilin Yu
Interim Department Secretary: Adam Finestone
Community Development Technician: Tony Rozzi

City Attorney: Pamela Thompson

Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Chase

1. Approval of Minutes – July 19, 2005, August 2, 2005

Motion to Approve Minutes of July 19, 2005 and August 2, 2005 Planning Commission meetings

Chase/Petersen

VOTE: 6-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

2. Communication

Planning Manager Akin introduced new planning staff member Tony Rozzi, who would be replacing Adam Finestone as the Community Development Technician. Chair Sammut welcomed staff member Tony Rozzi to the Commission.

3. Public Comment

None at this time.

4. 166 Riviera Court

Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a large family day care operation in a single-family residential zone; per Section 12.84.200 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. – Naila & Walid Nimri (Owner/Applicant) **UP 05-50**

Planning Manager Akin briefly updated the status of the project, and provided reasons for continuation. Recommended continuation of this item to a future meeting as there were several items that still needed to be addressed. The garage should be used as a garage and not as a recreational room with a pool table. After a visit to the site with the Fire Department, Planning Manager Akin expressed concern that for a large day care, two exits to the outside are needed: Currently, one of these exits leads to the garage and does not satisfy Fire code. Thirdly, staff would like the applicant to communicate with the neighbors before this is sent up for Commission review. And fourthly, there are not enough smoke alarms in the existing day care and staff would like to see that resolved before addressing the potential expansion of the facility.

Commissioner Chase corrected bulleted item on staff report to reflect that applicant “shall install” and not “should install” adequate fire alarms for existing facility.

Naila Walid, the applicant, explained that she currently has a license for 8 children and wants to apply to have a 14-child day care facility. She has made the recommended changes as outlined in the staff report but did not get a Fire inspection in time for the

Commission meeting. For this reason, she is requesting a continuance to a future meeting date.

Public comment opened.

Edith Bach, 176 Riviera Court, stated that indeed San Bruno does need childcare facilities but believes this expanded facility is not a good fit for Riviera Court because it is a Cul-de-Sac. Each car that drives in must drive out and because of today's high cost of rents, many families share a house and garages are used as storage. This has caused a parking problem and she worries that this problem will be amplified by the facility expansion. She also mentioned that she spoke with Planning Manager Aknin regarding a list of Registered Sex Offenders in the area and would like a copy given to both the Applicant and herself.

Commissioner Chase asked how public comment would be affected in the future if the Commission moved to continue this item. Chair Sammut answered that public comment would be reopened at that time.

Edna Daga, unstated Address, was opposed for several reasons. Increased noise will bother the mostly retired population of the court, which has 8 of 13 homeowners retired. Parking is currently a major problem and often blocks access to homeowner driveways. She is also concerned about increased traffic that could be generated at the drop off area of the facility. Finally, her biggest concern was the difficulty in selling a home nearby such a facility and the potential fall in property value she could experience.

Public comment closed and it will be reopened when this project is heard again in the future.

Motion to Continue Use Permit 05-50 to a future Planning Commission meeting.

Johnson/Biasotti

VOTE: 6-0
AYES: All Commissioners present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

5. 451 El Camino Real

Request Conditional Use Permit to allow the sales of alcoholic beverages in conjunction with the operation of an existing restaurant (Cleo's Brazilian Steak House), per Chapters 12.84.210 and 12.96.100(C) of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. – Ildefonso Ramirez Perez/Cleo's Brazilian Steakhouse (Applicant); Anstell Ricossa (Owner) **UP-05-51**

Associate Planner Yu entered staff report.

Staff recommends approval of Use Permit 05-51 based on Findings of Fact (1-8) and Conditions of Approval (1-29).

Commissioner Johnson asked if there had been any issues in the past with this property. Associate Planner Yu answered in the negative, stating that no issues have been documented at the site, which was formerly a market/restaurant that did not serve any type of alcohol. Commissioner Johnson also asked how long the restaurant has been operating. Associate Planner Yu answered that the property has been operating in its current use for just over two (2) months.

Cleonir Lemes, the applicant, explained his reasons for requesting an alcohol permit. Said that he would like to serve beer and wine because many patrons who eat lunch and dinner request alcohol. Others have called his restaurant to find out if alcohol is served and when he answers no, they say they will not be coming to his restaurant until it is served. He felt he had lost a lot of business because of this.

Commissioner Chase asked why, upon Building and Fire Department inspection, Tenant Improvement work was done without permits. Applicant responded that he tried to make a few little changes to improve the kitchen and before he knew it, he had made several changes. Applicant also acknowledged that it was a big mistake and apologized. He had some difficulties making his front door handicap-accessible as well but he has found a way and is awaiting a permit from the City. Commissioner Chase also inquired how many exits the property has. Applicant responded that he has two exits but a locked gate blocks one exit and the Fire Department recommended it not be used as an emergency exit for this reason. Commissioner Chase expressed his concern over the safety of this current exit situation and asked for clarification from Planning Manager Akin. Planning Manager Akin responded that originally, the rear egress was used as a handicap exit but because the neighboring tenant was locking its portion of the gate, Applicant needed to make the front egress handicap-accessible. The current occupancy of the building has two restaurants sharing a rear-gated area and this area can no longer be relied upon as an emergency exit. Commissioner Chase commented that he would like to see this potential safety problem addressed. Planning Manager Akin stated that Condition of Approval 20 should resolve this issue. Commissioner Chase however, stated his desire to see this safety issue fixed immediately regardless of a pending license to sell beer and wine. Planning Manager Akin responded that because Applicant's restaurant is zoned for an occupancy of 49 or less, the Planning Department can not require that there be two legal exits.

Commissioner Sammut asked if the Applicant had read the 29 Conditions of Approval and if he was familiar with them and agreed to them. Applicant responded in the affirmative.

Public comment opened.

Public comment closed.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-51 subject to Findings of Fact 1-8 and Conditions of Approval 1-29.

Johnson/Petersen

VOTE: 5-1
AYES:
NOES: Chase
ABSTAIN:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by mailing notices to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on Friday, August 5, 2005, and legal notice published in the San Mateo Times, Saturday, August 6, 2005.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, and Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Interior alteration to an existing facility.
5. The proposal will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use.
6. The proposal will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city.
7. The proposal is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for commercial purposes.
8. The proposed use will comply with the performance standards set forth in SBMC 12.84.210 (attached as Exhibit "D") for the following reasons.
 - The proposed use of the property as a restaurant with beer and wine sales is compatible with surrounding uses, which include restaurants, bars, retail stores, offices and other similar uses.
 - The activity will not jeopardize, endanger or result in adverse effects to the health, peace or safety or persons residing or working in the surrounding area as

staff has required several conditions of approval. These conditions of approval further help to mitigate any possible impacts.

- The Community Development Director has the ability to call this application back to the Planning Commission for review, if he/she finds that the use is negatively impacting the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, if any unforeseen impacts occur, the use can be further reviewed.
- By obtaining this Use Permit, and subsequently obtaining approval from the Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control the applicant will be in compliance with local and state regulations. As required by the local and state law, the City will issue a “need and necessity” letter to the Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control upon approval of this Use Permit.
- A condition of approval requires all activity to occur indoors; therefore there will be an insignificant increase in noise for surrounding neighborhood.
- A condition of approval requires that all patrons use the front door as the primary means of access, therefore pedestrian activity will occur on El Camino Real and not on the residential street behind.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary Hearing" to the Community Development Department within 30 days of approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-51 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-51 shall expire one (1) year from the date of approval unless the plan is executed.
2. The restaurant use shall be conducted according to the plans accompanying this report and approved by the Planning Commission, except as required to be modified by these conditions of approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior review and approval by the Community Development Director.
3. The applicant and any successor in interest, shall agree to operate the restaurant at 451 El Camino Real in the manner as described in the staff report and in the applicant's support statement. Any deviation or change in business activities shall require prior authorization by the Community Development Director. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in the City of San Bruno instituting revocation hearings.
4. All signs shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department in accordance with the Sign Regulations of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance.
5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City.

6. The applicant shall conduct regular maintenance of the site to maintain the premises and remove debris and litter at the front and rear of the building.
7. The permitted hours of operation of the restaurant shall be as follows:
Everyday: 11:00 A.M. – 12:00 A.M.
8. Any changes from the hours of operation shall require prior authorization of the Community Development Director.
9. The applicant/owner shall provide prompt cleaning/repainting of any graffiti on the building exterior.
10. The applicant shall comply with all Alcohol and Beverage Control requirements.
11. Applicant shall comply with all aspects of San Bruno Municipal Code 12.84.210.
12. The applicant shall meet all San Mateo County Health Department requirements regarding the creation and operation of a restaurant.
13. All patrons shall utilize the front door to enter the business. Patrons of the business shall not use the rear door adjacent to the residential neighborhood.
14. All business activities, including eating and drinking, shall occur indoors.
15. The Community Development Director may call this back to the Planning Commission if he/she finds that the business is not complying with the required performance standards or conditions of approval.

FIRE DEPARTMENT CONDITIONS

16. Applicant shall apply for an assembly permit through the Fire Department for A-3 occupancy.
17. Provide emergency lighting and exit pathway in assembly and dining area.
18. Provide illuminated exit signs.
19. The occupancy load is limited to 49 people or less. Maximum occupancy sign shall be posted.
20. The applicant shall work with the Fire Department to address the modification made to the floor plan, which results in the rear door not being a legal emergency exit door.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT CONDITIONS

21. Install backflow devices for domestic, irrigation, and fire lines. Show size, locations and details of service lines on plans.

POLICE DEPARTMENT CONDITIONS

22. Loitering in or about the premises is prohibited.
23. All violations of the law, or threatened violations of the law shall be immediately reported to the San Bruno Police Department and full cooperation by employees and management shall be given.
24. Any request by anyone in the establishment for an employee to contact the Police shall be immediately honored, without question.
25. Labor Code section 6404.5 regulating smoking shall be enforced at all times.
26. Management shall post all Police Department conditions of approval under load occupancy sign.
27. Address numbers must be at least 8" high, on a contrasting background, easily visible from the street. The address number shall also be visible at night.
28. Adequate lighting of grounds contiguous to the building shall be provided with enough lighting of sufficient wattage to provide adequate illumination to make clearly visible the presence of any person on or about the premises during the hours of darkness and provide a safe secure environment for all persons and property on site.
29. The applicant must obtain an Alcohol Beverage Control license to sell beer and wine on the premises and comply with all their rules and regulations.

Chair Sammut advised of 10-day appeal period.

6. 521 3rd Ave.

Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a first story addition which proposes to increase the gross floor area by more than 50%, and a Minor Modification to allow the addition to encroach 2'-0" into the required 5'-0" side yard setback, per Sections 12.200.030.B.1 and 12.120.010.B of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance – Sergio Galdamez (Applicant), Michael Bernard (Owner) **UP-05-44; MM-05-12**

Associate Planner Yu entered staff report.

Staff recommends approval of UP 05-44 and MM 05-12 based on Findings of Fact (1-11) and Conditions of Approval (1-13).

Michael Bernard, the owner, briefly described the project. Expressed that he and his wife and two teenage girls live in a two-bedroom house and need more room. Also mentioned that the paved concrete in front of his house, aside from the driveway, was

done by Public Works while working on a sewer project and was done at the request of the owner. He has three long vehicles and wanted the extra driveway space.

Chair Sammut explained that as a Condition of Approval, Applicant would need to tear up that paving. Applicant agrees to the Condition if that is what needs to be done to have the project approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Johnson thanked the Applicant for giving her a tour of the property site today. Stated that she understands the paving that was put in was done at the request of the Applicant and was a utility project. He asked if they could pour cement to increase his driveway since the ground was torn up and they complied. A City Inspector came out during that time and approved the one side expansion but would not let the other side of Applicant's driveway be paved as well.

Commissioner Chase asked for clarification on the applicant's comment "If I've got to do what I've got to do, I will". Applicant restated that if the expanded driveway needs to be removed, he is willing to do it so the Commission will approve the project.

Public comment opened.

Public comment closed.

Commissioner Johnson asked staff for clarification on the driveway situation. It appeared that the applicant would prefer not to remove the parking but of course, it would look better to have landscaping. Planning Manager Akin cited the City Zoning Ordinance as not allowing parking within the front yard area. Commissioner Johnson also asked what the ramifications would be of having the Applicant tear out a project implemented by the Public Works Department. Planning Manager Akin stated that he had not spoken to Public Works and would follow up for clarification.

Commissioner Marshall stated that the parking within a front yard area was a code enforcement issue and inquired whether the Commission or Planning Department could require the Applicant to take out the concrete paving. Planning Manager Akin responded that if the Commission felt that the property's front yard would look better with landscaping rather than concrete, a Condition of Approval could be included to mandate this. Staff is recommending such Condition so that 1) the Applicant cannot park in the yard and 2) the property will have a better appearance and promote neighborhood beauty.

Commissioner Petersen inquired about the plot plan and the garage width with side yard setbacks. Commissioner Petersen wondered if the expansion of the driveway with a paved side setback included could provide enough parking width for two cars, even though the garage is single vehicle occupancy. Commissioner Petersen also inquired whether the paving in the front yard could be removed enough to provide room for landscaping but also compromise and allow enough space for someone to step out of a second car in the driveway onto cement, rather than onto a wet lawn. Planning Manager Akin responded that there is some latitude there in which staff can design a Condition of Approval.

Commissioner Johnson agreed with the idea laid out by Commissioner Petersen and cited that this compromise would allow two spaces for parking in the driveway but also maintain some landscaping directly in front of the Applicant's property. Commissioner Petersen mentioned that this was his point. Applicant would get better landscaping and still maintain some off-street parking.

Commissioner Marshall requested that the applicant respond to this idea, as put forth by Commissioner Petersen and supported by Commissioner Johnson. Applicant said that the width of his driveway is not so much the issue as the length of the driveway, which is too short even for his shortest vehicle. Applicant said that children walking to the nearby school on the sidewalk constantly scratched his cars. This is because his vehicles often block the sidewalk when parked. Commissioner Petersen stated that he understood his concerns and that the Applicant was not alone in this respect, since many homeowners in San Bruno face this problem. Stated that he would like to see some sort of compromise made so that the applicant can retain some off-street parking. Applicant agreed.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-44 and Minor Modification 05-12 subject to Findings of Fact 1-11 and Conditions of Approval 1-13, with the addition that the driveway is allowed to remain three (3) feet to each side of the existing garage.

Petersen/Marshall

VOTE: 6-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by mailing notices to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on Friday, August 5, 2005, and legal notice published in the San Mateo Times, Saturday, August 6, 2005.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, and Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.

4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
6. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
7. The construction of the addition is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.
8. The off-street parking is adequate for the proposed residence.
9. Property is in the San Bruno Redevelopment Area and the proposed improvements are consistent with the San Bruno Redevelopment Plan.
10. The proposed addition is designed to continue the existing legal non-conforming side yard setback and is located to the rear of the existing residence so it is not visible from the street of access, therefore will not alter the general appearance of the residence in relation to the side property line and be in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
11. The proposed first story addition will continue a legal non conforming side yard setback, a condition which has been in existence since the construction of the existing residence in 1941, which has not pose as a detriment to the adjacent neighbor, and therefore it will not be detrimental to adjacent real properties.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-44 and Minor Modification 05-12 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-44 and Minor Modification 05-12 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.

2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. A landscape plan shall be submitted with the Building Department set of plans indicating that the paved portion of front yard will be removed and landscaped. The Director of Planning shall approve this landscape plan prior to the issuance of building permits. Prior to the final of the building permits, the paved portions of the front yard (other than the driveway) shall be removed and the area shall be landscaped.
4. The request for a Use Permit for an addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on August 16, 2005, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
5. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
6. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
7. The residence shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
8. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.
9. Overhangs are required to be fire rated and are limited to a maximum of 1'-0" in width.

Department of Public Works

10. The applicant must obtain an encroachment permit through the Public Works Department prior to issuance of the Building Permit.
11. Storm water from new and existing roof downspouts and other on-site drainage shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water drainage system or through a curb drain to the gutter. The existing curb drain does not have a permit. The new curb drain requires a permit.

Fire Department

12. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
13. The project must comply with all future Fire Department conditions, as required during the plan check review by the Building and Safety Department.

Chair Sammut advised of 10-day appeal period.

7. 4300 Susan Drive

Request for a General Plan Amendment to change the current designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential at 40 dwelling units per acre, a Planned Development rezoning request to change the current zoning from Medium Density Planned-Development (P-D) to High Density Planned Development (P-D), and a Planned Development Permit (PDP) to allow the demolition of the existing medium density apartment complex and the development of new high density apartment complex, per Chapter 12 of the San Bruno Municipal Code. OP Property Management (Applicant/Owner). **GPA-05-01, ZC-05-01, PDP-05-02**

Contract Planner Costa Sanders entered staff report and gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Staff recommends approval of the Mitigated Negative environmental declaration, the General Plan request (GPA 05-01) and conditional approval of a Planned Development Zoning Change and Permit (ZC 05-01 and PDP 05-02).

Bill Burton, Korvei Engineers, discussed traffic impacts related to the redevelopment of this property. The Traffic study looked at intersections in the area and considered the impact of development on the circulation of those intersections. Mr. Burton found that traffic would be affected with the loss of the cut through route from Susan to Highland Street. The study showed that traffic was approximately 50-60 vehicles during the AM and PM peak hours on that route. The study found that there would be an average of 1-3 seconds increased delay at the surrounding intersections. This would not result in the failure of any intersections per Department of Transportation criteria. The second issue was the line of sight difficulties for the merge from Highland onto Sharp Park Road. Mr. Burton researched accident records for the last six years and found that there were NO accidents recorded in that location. Mr. Burton recommended trimming landscaping to improve visibility and new lane striping might help the turn at Sharp Park Rd.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the study incorporated the potential increase in traffic from the development with the 1-3 second delay forecast as presented. Mr. Burton answered in the affirmative.

Commissioner Chase echoed Commissioner Johnson's question and then asked what the math would truly be if one were to multiply the 1-3 second delay by the number of

cars on that route at peak travel hours. Commissioner Chase wondered if the delay would be more like 1 or 2 minutes per vehicle once the 1-3 second delay was multiplied out. Mr. Burton agreed that the 1-3 second delay was per car but cumulatively, would increase the delay during heavy commute times. Korvei Engineers judge the quality of an intersection by measuring how long it takes a vehicle to move through that particular intersection. When conducting a traffic study, traffic engineers need to evaluate whether the intersection “works” and how long it takes a vehicle to move through it. Commissioner Chase mentioned that he drives that route everyday and is very surprised that there have been no accidents at that major intersection. Taking that into consideration, would there be a way to make the intersection more efficient instead of just settling for an intersection that “doesn’t fail”? Mr. Burton answered that the intersection does have modern signal equipment and is using the most modern, up to date software currently. There isn’t much other way to improve the intersection’s efficiency than to add lanes.

Commissioner Johnson asked when the study was done. Mr. Burton answered that it was done in the Spring of 2005. Commissioner Johnson also asked whether the study looked at this particular corner or all of Skyline. Mr. Burton answered that 10 intersections in the area were studied. Three of these intersections were on Skyline and they operate at a level of C or D, meaning that they have average delays of 40-60 seconds during peak hours.

Commissioner Marshall wanted to know how the study was done, particularly if the study considered current traffic amounts and then forecast based on those counts. Mr. Burton answered in the affirmative. Commissioner Marshall asked about the vacancy rate at the time the study was completed. Mr. Burton answered that they did not take vacancy into consideration. Commissioner Marshall asked if the vacancy at that time was 30%, or 150 units and if that would impact the traffic study. Mr. Burton replied that it would be hard to tell without redoing projections. Mr. Burton would assume that traffic would go up and delays would increase but the incremental additions of delay would not change the conclusions of the report.

Commissioner Johnson stated that during her tour of the site today, very few apartments seemed to be occupied. Commissioner Johnson wondered if the vacancy rate of the Spring was as low as today. This could cause a tremendous surge in traffic and delays that aren’t currently accounted for under the traffic study. Planning Manager Aknin answered that he understands the vacancy rate to be approximately 1/3 vacant, or 100 units unoccupied in the Spring of 2005. As for the rates today, the applicant should be able to provide those numbers.

Commissioner Chase wanted a “failed traffic intersection” to be further explained. Mr. Burton explained that the true definition is when a traffic intersection reaches an unacceptable level of delay, an E or F condition. This is usually an 80+ second delay. Contract Planner Costa Sanders added that the projected delays were listed in the Negative Declaration of the staff report.

Commissioner Petersen questioned if local residents could still use the proposed project as a cut through. According to the architect’s rendering, the roads appeared to be

accessible. Mr. Burton stated that he understood that the proposed entrances and exits were to be gated and this would not be possible.

Chair Sammut wanted to know if the residents on Elston could still take Highland to Sharp Park and if residents on Susan could still make the right turn onto Skyline as well. Mr. Burton answered in the affirmative.

Chair Sammut asked Contract Planner Costa Sanders what the setbacks were going to be on the town homes on Highland and Elston. Chair Sammut clarified that he was most interested in what the driveway lengths would be.

Recess to find that information @ 8:10 pm.

Meeting resumed at 8:16 pm.

Contract Planner Costa Sanders formally introduced herself to the Planning Commission.

Planning Manager Akin provided driveway lengths, as requested by Chair Sammut. For the town homes on Elston, there are approximately 24' between the clusters and the driveways are (from south to north): 12', 14', 11', 15', 11', and 20'. The Highland town homes have 5', 7', 5', 7', 11', 7', 11', 15' and 11' length driveways.

Chair Sammut mentioned he was concerned with the parking situation on Highland and the fact that the driveways on Highland will not be long enough to park a car on. Since tandem parking requires a parking exception and the driveways are so shallow, Chair Sammut has serious concerns regarding the proposed homes on Highland. The Elston proposal seemed to have some serious flaws as well, specifically the shallow driveways.

David Gazek, with AIMCO, the developer, made himself available for questions.

Commissioner Marshall wanted to know if the Applicant, as represented by David Gazek of AIMCO, had read the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Applicant answered in the affirmative and remarked that AIMCO hired SB Architects who have done other work in the City of San Bruno. Commissioner Marshall then asked to be convinced why he should approve the setbacks and driveway lengths on the proposed town houses. Applicant invited the architect to address this issue.

John Eller, president of SB Architects in San Francisco, presented his project and gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Brief intermission to change the audio/video tape at 8:43pm.

Meeting re-convened at 8:47pm

Paul Litierra, Gazardo Partnership (Landscape Architects) described the project and gave a brief PowerPoint presentation.

Commissioner Petersen remarked that the residents of Elston Drive have gone from looking up at a shopping center for many years to a towering structure presently and in the future it looks like they will continue to look up to towering structures. Commissioner Petersen asked the landscape architect to clarify the landscape screening that could be used on the proposed project. Mr. Litierra has not specifically picked plant material yet but had some plant types that would work and listed those. Stated that the land slope makes the job somewhat difficult, as does the wind. Commissioner Petersen cited that there is a basic conflict between preserving views from the proposed first floor apartments and planting any substantial landscape screening to screen the view from Elston. Mr. Litierra responded that indeed this could be done because of the hillside's slope. Commissioner Petersen asked Staff to make a note of this and make sure that if this proposal is approved, there is attention given to the landscape screening issue.

Chair Sammut asked if Palm Trees would survive in that climate. Mr. Litierra answered in the affirmative. Secondly, Chair Sammut asked about the landscape strip between Sharp Park and Highland and if that would be maintained as part of the project and also be designed to improve the sight-distancing. Mr. Litierra answered in the affirmative. Thirdly, Chair Sammut asked what the plan would be for the hillside in the event that the town houses were not approved. Mr. Litierra answered that it was a difficult problem but they would attempt to maintain stability and also improve the visual impact with native grasses and other landscaping. These would not be easy to maintain considering the steep slope of the hillside.

Commissioner Chase complimented Mr. Litierra on the overall landscape plans. The only issue he had was concerning Mr. Litierra's response to the scenario of an approved project without the town houses. Commissioner Chase asked for a better description of what could be done to the slopes if the town houses did not come to fruition. Mr. Litierra responded that they had not done a plan that didn't include the town houses. He would recommend not playing with the hill so as to not disrupt the slope. He also mentioned that he shared the architect's perspective in that, as a transitional element, the town houses work better than what is currently out there. Commissioner Chase felt that terraces could look nice. Mr. Litierra responded that they could be a lot of work and don't really add a financial gain to the project.

Commissioner Johnson mentioned her concern regarding the Palm Trees and those she's seen in other areas and how poorly they seem to grow in a San Bruno climate. Mr. Litierra answered that palms could do surprisingly well and have done so in places like San Francisco and other coastal cities. Commissioner Johnson mentioned the Palm trees in Daly City as struggling and thought their weather comparable to that of San Bruno.

Planning Manager Akin mentioned that the peer review architect Larry Canon was present and able to answer any questions if applicable.

Commissioner Johnson asked the Applicant if there was any possibility of the proposed apartments becoming ownership units at some time in the future. Applicant stated that AIMCO's mission is primarily apartments and as a publicly traded company, that is their

main focus. Market conditions could dictate a move to condominiums but at this time, the company's focus remains on apartments. Commissioner Johnson asked if there has been any discussion regarding this. Applicant responded in the affirmative and in the future they would consider any use of the property that would be the best economic use and in the interest of the company's shareholders. For now however, the project is conceived as apartments only.

Commissioner Marshall inquired about the parking breakdown. Commissioner Marshall felt that if everyone were living there, there would only be two parking spaces for guests. Project Architect answered in the negative. With a parking ratio of one (1) space to a one (1) bedroom unit and two (2) spaces to a two (2) bedroom unit, there would still be a parking supply in excess of 100 spaces. Commissioner Marshall felt that this ratio was much too low. He was also concerned about the Elston town homes and their layout on the street. Commissioner Marshall wondered if the homes could be only two stories and a bit wider so as to offer a two car, side-by-side garage. Project Architect answered that this idea would not provide a viable design with usable space on the first level. . Commissioner Marshall also inquired whether a footprint with only two stories would work best with the small scale of Elston. Project Architect was concerned with the amount of ventilation provided in the first floor space, particularly since it would then be tucked into the hillside and receive little natural light.

Commissioner Chase was curious as to whether there could be a side entrance into the garage rather than a front entrance. This could extend the driveway and provide more off street parking. Project Architect answered that this could be possible, but to go into the side, a solid, 10 ft tall retaining wall would need to be built and would also be visible to the street front. Commissioner Chase also asked if there was more land along Elston that could be developed, allowing this scenario to work. .

Commissioner Chase also inquired about remote control access inside the complex. Project Architect responded that the remotes would open the master gates and would then open the tenant's individual residential parking structure. Commissioner Chase also requested clarification on the main entry drive. Project Architect described the entry area as a passive spot, with pedestrian access.

Commissioner Chase wanted clarification on Figure 8-A-B. Project Architect interceded to say that the figure was inaccurate. The stairwells have since been changed to improve the façade design.

Commissioner Petersen asked if the Applicant still owned the corner lot at Sharp Park and what they intended to do with it. Stated that he would like to see the lot remain grass and not have a gas station built there. Applicant answered that it would remain grass and also house the Leasing Office building. Applicant also explained that the corner in question has many utilities underground which prevent any large-scale development there.

Commissioner Petersen remarked that it was important that the tenants become long-term residents and that the complex maintain a high occupancy rate. He requested specifics on the kind of sound reduction programs that would be implemented to prevent

noise between upper and lower units and side-to-side units. Project Architect explained that they try to exceed the residential standards for impact and wall noise. A mat of acoustic underlayment would be used when there were hard surfaces and carpet and pads would be used throughout. Commissioner Petersen asked if the building would be cement or wood framed. Project Architect answered that the buildings will be wood framed.

Commissioner Chase asked if there would be elasta-seal floors. Commissioner Chase stated that this could sometimes be a cause of noise in apartment complexes.

Commissioner Johnson remarked that the current apartments are well known for their mold and rust. What materials would be used to prevent that this time? Commissioner Johnson thought the fitness rooms could be too small for the size of the complex and wanted clarification if there would be a deck roof. Project Architect answered that the current construction has certainly made them consider the materials in the proposed project. The ventilation is bad and so the project intends to make sure it is dramatically improved in the new homes. New siding materials will consist of cementitious board, a composite material that does not rust or absorb moisture. It is non-combustible and does not allow mold growth. Other materials will consist of stainless steel. Commissioner Johnson asked for clarification on the cementitious board. Project Applicant answered that it is made of concrete and is a composite material. Also said that the units are very spacious and compared to other regional city development, very much a market rate unit. There will be no roof deck but there will be private, outside spaces for individual units. Applicant added that AIMCO did not build the current project. AIMCO's property has been plagued by the weather, the way it was built and the materials used. The project is no longer viable and AIMCO intends to build a good investment that will last a long time. Project Architect also responded to the fitness center size, saying that it was fairly generous for the given size of the proposal. This is in part because of the covered pool.

Commissioner Chase requested more details on the finish schedule and floor noise. Commissioner Chase wondered if the Applicant would be using a better than average sound deadening floor and pad material. Applicant answered that since apartments are AIMCO's business, they must make high quality apartments that retain renters. This proposal would be a "high B" or as "close to an A" as possible in terms of apartment grade and quality. They plan to make sound a non-issue.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the Project Architect had any more ideas regarding parking and driveways for the town homes. Project Architect answered that the company has gone through several scenarios and the current proposal was based on the slope of the hillside. This proposal makes the maximum, highest and best use of the land. Commissioner Johnson wondered why the town homes couldn't be pushed further back into the hillside so as to provide more driveway length. Project Architect answered that this would bunker down the unit too much and diminish the natural light afforded to the units with the current design.

Chair Sammut asked if the Applicant agreed to the Conditions of Approval, as stated in the staff report. Applicant answered in the affirmative. Chair Sammut also asked

Contact Planner Costa Sanders why there were no Police or Fire Conditions of Approval. Contract Planner Costa Sanders answered that there are Fire Conditions of Approval listed in the staff report (Resolution).

Commissioner Marshall asked staff whether there was ever a condition of approval for public access placed on the private street through the current development. Planning Manager Akin responded that although the street has always been used as a public cut through, all records show that it is a private street and does not receive funding from Public Works or any other City department.

Commissioner Petersen asked where new Conditions of Approval would be added. Planning Manager Akin answered that they would go after the Fire Conditions of Approval in the Resolution.

Chair Sammut introduced Larry Cannon of the Cannon Design Group. Mr. Cannon reviewed the project on the City's behalf.

Mr. Cannon explained that his overall evaluation of the proposal was that it was much better now than when it began. There are large buildings but it is a top quality design. The town houses have always been problematic but he does not see an easy solution to that. His only caution was that there are some very prominent stair towers at the corners and he would like to see the "green screen" developed to minimize these. Mr. Cannon also mentioned that he would like to see more conifer trees planted along the edge of the development to blend in with the existing landscape. Also, Mr. Cannon had questions on the gated community concept but believes he understands now after the discussion between the Commission and Applicant. Overall, he felt it was a quality development proposal.

Commissioner Marshall asked if Mr. Cannon believed there would be sufficient parking for the proposed development. Mr. Cannon answered in the affirmative but cautioned that he's not sure how it will work exactly.

Public Comment Open

Joanna Dunn, 3950 Coronado Way, read a letter summarizing what she learned from the project so far. Mentioned that very few homeowners knew about that first meeting and her main concern was that the presentation given during that first meeting gave a 73% increase in population projection. This worried her. By closing the community with gates, it will adversely affect traffic and the quality of life for the local area. Also doesn't believe the slopes will be beautified because of the town homes and large buildings that will be going in.

Sammuel Pilli, 3291 Highland Dr, had a couple concerns. He was very worried about traffic backups on Highland, Pacific Heights and Sharp Park. Also worried about how this development could change the community's character. Speeding cars and fears about his own young children getting injured also concerned Mr. Pilli. He would like to see the access points for the development changed to mitigate the increase in traffic.

Julie Piori, 3821 Elston, was happy to see that the staff recommended the removal of the town homes. The parking variance was also a problem, since right now, with a high vacancy in the current apartments, there was overflow-parking traffic in the neighborhood. Does not believe the neighborhood can handle any more vehicles for parking. Thirdly, the elimination of the cut through could focus traffic on the local streets and she would like to see a new traffic study on the local streets conducted. Mrs. Piori met with an attorney and thinks the current cut through situation meets the criteria for a proscriptive easement. The cut through cannot be eliminated and access has not been denied for 5 years.

Jenny Pitch, 3981 Elston, said she has lived in the home since 1960. Would like to see the hillside maintained and because it is a single-family residential area, town homes are not good. They will tower over the homes and look into their backyards. Right now, the area is peaceful with very little traffic. She does not want to see the street spoiled by the proposed development. She disagrees that Highland is not a city street. It has mailboxes, lane striping and street sweepers clean it. It should belong to the taxpayer.

Jane Sunrise, 3971 Elston, said she does not want town homes opposite her. Thirty years ago when she moved in, there were no homes opposite her. That is the way Mrs. Sunrise likes it. The proposal will increase traffic.

Dave Gutierrez, Summit Road, is concerned that the developers only focused on how the improvements would improve "their" property. He wants to know how this development would improve his neighborhood. Twenty years ago, he was a part of the meetings for the first development. The previous developer realized that the access route was maintained for the good of the community and Mr. Gutierrez is upset that the Applicant does not. He would also like to see open parks created, that both the gated proposal and the community could share.

Jim McMillan, 3921 Elston Dr, said that the last time he was here, he was fighting the Evergreen Development. He addressed his concerns regarding the stability of the slopes, considering it is fill and not a natural bluff.

Tim Kaufman, 3891 Elston Dr., said he was completely opposed to the town homes. He was curious about how many cars were towed in 2004 from the Treetop apartments. The amount of traffic in the area right now is limited and he'd really like to see the cut through kept open to the public.

Carolyn Livergood, 140 Sharron Dr., appreciated the Commission's concerns. Mentioned that the fence along the Evergreen apartments is horrible and the weeds behind Treetops are terrible. Her main concern was regarding the potential increase in traffic. At her request, an employee of Samtrans came out. The employee observed the traffic and found that 120 cars completely stopped at the stop sign posted on College Drive. 88 didn't stop at all. And this was in 40 minutes. Mrs. Livergood would also like to see the roads in the area widened.

Sabramanian Krishnamurthy, 3070 Summit Rd., was concerned about the current and future-parking problem. He was in a car accident the other day and explained that the

accident occurred because the other driver could not see him driving because of all the cars parked along the street. He was also worried about losing his scenic view from his home and losing the access road.

John Cleary, 3060 Summit Rd., stated he was a neighbor of the previous speaker. He is mainly concerned about losing his scenic view and the traffic increase on Summit.

Marsha Dempsey, 3231 Susan Dr., does not approve of the request to increase the density with a zoning change. Believes that this proposal does not provide enough parking for the residents.

Lorraine Hill, Treetops resident, stated that at its maximum capacity, there was not enough parking for the residents and guests. This will be the case for the proposal as well. Her concern though, is with the environmental factors of the area. Her apartment has constantly suffered from humidity because of the very foggy conditions in the area.

Public comment closed.

Commissioner Chase expressed that he was not in favor of the project as presented due to staff and neighborhood concerns.

Commissioner Marshall had two concerns. He would like to see the town homes removed and that there simply would not be enough parking for the proposal and this needs to be resolved in some way.

Commissioner Chase remarked that the Architect and Landscape Architect have done a great job of being receptive to changes as the project has progressed.

Commissioner Biasotti was very concerned about guest parking and public transit. . He also felt that after hearing the reasons behind the neighborhood concerns, he could no longer support the town homes.. Commissioner Biasotti expressed that possibly there could be a compromise made so that the town homes become green space and replace some of the "in-lieu" fees for park space.

Commissioner Johnson echoed that parking was a big issue. Commissioner Johnson would not like to approve a project that has shortened driveways because it does not improve the parking situation in the local neighborhood. She would like to see a more accurate parking ratio used that reflects a new era of commuting and vehicle ownership.

Commissioner Petersen asked the Applicant to clarify how many guest parking spots were available outside of the proposed project gates. Applicant responded that they are proposing 940 spaces, 910 for the complex and 30 for the town homes. AIMCO guarantees one (1) space per bedroom. With that count, 751 spaces will be accounted for. This leaves 159 spaces. Under the .1 guest spaces per unit in the City code, 51 spaces are needed for guest. This leaves 108 additional spaces for guest or tenant parking. Guest parking will be dispersed throughout the complex, both underground and on the surface.

Commissioner Marshall requested a breakdown of the number of one (1) and two (2) bedroom units in the proposed complex. Applicant answered that there will be 261 one bedroom units and 249 two bedroom units.

Chair Sammut asked the Applicant to imagine if two (2) spaces were provided for every unit, regardless of the number of bedrooms. With this scenario, the parking requirement would be 1,020 spaces. Chair Sammut was concerned that with a certain percentage of one bedroom units occupied by tenants with more than one vehicle, there would be a parking problem. Applicant responded that AIMCO typically exceeds the industry standard for parking spaces and with 1.7 spaces per unit, they have found that they provide adequate parking for their tenants. They find the current property at a 1.7 ratio to be adequate as well. Chair Sammut asked how to prove this adequacy. Applicant responded that through the financial bottom line and tenant retention, they know their parking is adequate. Chair Sammut mentioned that this might be because they can find parking on the local streets. He also mentioned his discontent with the Applicant's reference to the City required parking ratio of 2.1 as being on the "high end of the spectrum". Chair Sammut asked the Applicant to recognize that parking issues in San Bruno are unique from other national cities. Applicant apologized for any misinterpretation. Stated that AIMCO has worked with staff to come up with these numbers and feels that this proposal was a maximized compromise between the Applicant and the City. Chair Sammut asked Planning Manager Akin if there would be a parking exception for this project or does staff feel that the 1.7 ratio was adequate. Planning Manager Akin responded that there would be no parking exception and that the traffic engineer could answer the question in greater detail.

Commissioner Marshall asked the Applicant if they would guarantee to only rent to people as long as they could provide parking. Applicant responded that he could not answer that question. Commissioner Marshall said that parking passes could solve this problem. Applicant did not agree with the analysis. Stated that as a company, all they can go on is the historical records of the industry. In their perspective, the 1.7 ratio is adequate. Commissioner Marshall also stated that he believes that 98% of the units will have at least two (2) cars. If this adversely affects the complex resident, that is fine. But if parking overflow issues will adversely affect the neighborhood, then there is a major problem. Applicant stated that as a company, they work in cities very similar to San Bruno and their calculations work. They do not want unhappy tenants. They have no intention of having overflow parking in the neighborhood.

Chair Sammut stopped further discussion with the developer and brought discussion back to the Commission of the project. Stated that after the traffic engineer spoke, the Commission needed to come to some conclusion.

Mr. Burton stated that based on national parking statistics, this proposal would satisfy average peak parking demand in similar sized apartment complexes throughout the country.

Commissioner Chase asked what the difference would be between a motion to deny without prejudice vs. a motion to continue. City Attorney Pamela Thompson explained

that with a motion to deny with or without prejudice, the Applicant was entitled to appeal within a ten (10) day period to the City Council. If the proposal were continued, there would be no final decision to appeal to the City Council.

Break to change tape: 10:43 pm

Meeting resumed at 10:45 pm

Commissioner Petersen asked Chair Sammut for permission to get an answer to a question he had previously asked. Commissioner Petersen asked to be shown on a display board where the guest parking was located at the proposed development site. Contract Planner Costa Sanders responded that the applicant had not designated the location of guest parking yet. Outside of the gate will certainly have some but there are no specific spots assigned yet.

Commissioner Biasotti asked what the high density zoning currently was in the General Plan. Planning Manager Akin responded that it was 30 units per acre. Commissioner Biasotti also asked why the Commission was being asked to consider a 40 unit per acre density for this application. Planning Manager Akin said that it had been proposed as the new designation for high density residential in the soon to be updated General Plan. Applicant had understood that this would be the new allowable density and since the General Plan has not yet been updated, they are asking for it in their Planned Development application. Commissioner Biasotti asked if the Commission was being asked to approve something that had not yet come to fruition. Planning Manager Akin replied that the Commission was being asked to review a change in density request as part of this Applicant's proposal only.

Motion to Continue to a future date.

Chase/ no second

Motion dies.

Commissioner Petersen stated that the proposal was going to the City Council regardless of decision and that the issues were on the table to allow the Commission to act and forward a recommendation to the City Council. Commissioner Petersen explained that two motions needed to be made. A motion on the Mitigated Negative Declaration and then a motion on the Commission's recommendation needed to be made. He then explained that he would like to recommend a parking ratio of 2.1 spaces per unit with no town homes on Elston and 50 additional, guest parking spaces.

Motion to approve Resolution 2005-07 (Mitigated Negative Declaration).

Petersen/Biasotti

Chair Sammut mentioned that one of the community speakers brought up an interesting point concerning the seismic safety of the proposal site. In the Mitigated Negative Declaration, a rupture of a known earthquake fault was deemed a less than significant

impact. Chair Sammut had a hard time agreeing with this fact, considering the San Andreas Fault was 700 ft away from the site. The Serra Fault is one (1) mile away. Also, Chair Sammut stated he was against the town homes on both streets, mainly because of the driveway lengths and tandem parking. He also stated that the traffic study might have been a bit flawed because of the time that the study was conducted and the parking situation was not satisfactory. Regarding the density issue, Chair Sammut was not very happy with the density of this proposal. With that said however, Chair Sammut felt that the proposal had an excellent design and complemented the site very well.

Commissioner Chase asked what motions were on the table. Commissioner Petersen stated there was a motion to approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Roll Call vote: Motion to approve Resolution 2005-07 (Mitigated Negative Declaration).

VOTE: 5-1
AYES:
NOES: Chase
ABSTAIN:

Motion Approved 5-1.

Commissioner Petersen stated that he was making the next motion based on the consensus that the Commission had a good sense of what concerns staff and the community held.

Motion to approve Resolution 2005-08, recommending City Council approval of General Plan Amendment GPA-05-01 and conditional approval of Planned Development Zoning Change ZC-05-01 and Planned Development Permit PDP-05-02 with the additional conditions that the parking be 2.1 times the total number of units, that there be no town homes on Elston and that there be at least 50 guest parking spaces in addition to parking for tenants on the site.

City Attorney Pamela Thompson clarified that the Commission would be forwarding a recommendation to the City Council and it would be heard by the City Council regardless of the Commission's recommendation.

Applicant stated that in the City of San Bruno Zoning Ordinance, the 2.1 ratio included tenant and guest parking requirements. Applicant wanted to know if the motion was to adopt the City's 2.1 spaces per unit and additionally, ask the Applicant to provide 50 more guest spaces. Commissioner Petersen answered in the affirmative and also responded that he wanted to pick a guest parking number that would provide the amount of parking that the community and Commission could agree on. He also stated that though the City Council would make the ultimate decision, this motion reflected the Commission's desire to see parking sufficiently provided.

Commissioner Chase wanted to clarify that the staff report already recommended removing the town homes on Elston. He also stated that he wanted to offer the City Council a decision that resolved the concerns of the Commission and that this current motion did not do that.

Commissioner Petersen further explained that his intentions were to put elements into the recommendation that would clarify the Commission's position to City Council. This motion should delineate the Commission's feelings on the current proposal.

Commissioner Chase stated that the Commission needed more time to address the issues that were presently contended.

Commissioner Biasotti agreed with Commissioner Chase and stated that he was uncomfortable approving a Planned Development with a higher density than the City Council had not approved. Commissioner Biasotti would like more time to consider the proposal.

Chair Sammut asked Commissioner Petersen if he would add to his motion the removal of the town homes on Highland. In regards to the parking, Chair Sammut asked Commissioner Petersen if he would strike the additional guest parking from the motion. Commissioner Petersen agreed to both amendments.

Commissioner Johnson requested staff to inform her how many units, parking spaces, and the number of one and two bedroom units at Shelter Creek. Planning Manager did not have the answers available and would find out for her and report back.

Motion to approve Resolution 2005-08, recommending City Council approval of General Plan Amendment GPA-05-01 and conditionally approve Planned Development Zoning Change ZC-05-01 and Planned Development Permit PDP-05-02 with the additional conditions that the parking be 2.1 times the total number of units and that there be no town homes on Elston Drive or Highland Drive.

Roll Call:

VOTE: 4-2
AYES:
NOES: Chase, Biasotti
ABSTAIN:

8. City Staff Discussion

Planning Manager Akin requested committee ARC members for the August 25th meeting. Commissioner Mishra confirmed earlier and Commissioners Marshall and Johnson would check their schedules.

Planning Manager Akin thanked Recording Secretary Finestone again and wished him the best of luck.

9. Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Biasotti requested an update on code enforcement information on 2550 Catalpa Way. Planning Manager Akin responded that they have since parked vehicles in the garage and turned off their spotlights. The addition is still awaiting final permit.

Commissioner Chase thanked Recording Secretary Finestone for his hard work.

10. Adjournment

Terry Jackson
Interim Secretary to the Planning
Commission
City of San Bruno

Joe Sammut, Chair
Planning Commission
City of San Bruno

NEXT MEETING: September 6, 2005

TJ/tr

Meeting was adjourned at 11:13 pm